## BEFORE THE OREGON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION

## Petition to Initiate Rulemaking and Take Other Actions to Protect Existing and Designated Uses of Fish and Wildlife From Point and Nonpoint Sources of Pesticides

## Table of Contents

| I. Introduction |   |  |  |  |
|-----------------|---|--|--|--|
| II.             | Requested Actions.  A. Proposed Rulemaking  |  |  |  |
| III.            | The National Marine Fisheries Service Biological Opinions on the Effects of Insecticides, Herbicides and Fungicides on Pacific Northwest Salmon and Steelhead   |  |  |  |
| IV.             | The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion on the Effects of Pesticides on Lost River Sucker, Shortnose Sucker, Modoc Sucker, Warner Sucker, Hutton Tui Chub, and Lahontan Cutthroat Trout.  |  |  |  |
| V.              | Effects of Pesticides on Aquatic Life and Limitations of Existing Regulatory Programs in Oregon to Protect Aquatic and Aquatic-Dependent Species  |  |  |  |
| VI.             | The Clean Water Act Requires Oregon Action.  A. Applicable Water Quality Standards.  B. The State is Required to Have Published Methods for the Use of Narrative Criteria for Toxics.  1. EPA's Pesticides General Permit.  2. Oregon's General Permit 2300A.  23 |  |  |  |
| VII.            | Need for Commission Adoption of the Proposed New Rules for Pesticides   |  |  |  |

|       |   | 3. Litigation on Oregon's CZARA Program Approval                             | 28   |  |
|-------|---|--|------|--|
|       |   | 4. Oregon Cannot Rely on EPA Action to Address its CZARA Program             |      |  |
|       |   | Requirements for Pesticides  | 28   |  |
|       | В.  | Use of Listed Pesticides in Oregon Based on the FIFRA Labels Violates Oregon |      |  |
|       |   | Water Quality Standards  | 29   |  |
|       |   | 1. Violation of Designated Use Support                                       |      |  |
|       |   | 2. Violation of Narrative Toxics Criteria                                    |      |  |
|       |   | 3. Violation of Tier I of the Antidegradation Policy                         |      |  |
|       | C.  | Inaction by Oregon Amounts to Authorizing Illegal "Take" Under the Endang    |      |  |
|       |   | Species Act  | 33   |  |
|       | ~   |  | •    |  |
| VIII. |   | nission Authority  | 36   |  |
|       | A.  | Commission Action is Authorized by State Statutes.                           | 36   |  |
|       | В.  | Commission Action To Regulate Pesticides is Not Precluded by FIFRA           | . 36 |  |
| IX.   | Commission Action Consistent with This Petition Will Support State Policies 3 |  |      |  |
| 171.  | A   | Granting This Petition Will Support the Agency's Toxics Reduction Strategy.  |      |  |
|       | Λ.  | 1. The Draft Toxics Reduction Strategy.                                      | 38   |  |
|       |   | 2. This Petition Supports the Goals of the Strategy                          | 30   |  |
|       | B.  | Oregon Policy on Protection of Sensitive Species Not Yet Listed as Threatene |      |  |
|       | <b>D</b> .  | and Endangered.  |      |  |
|       |   | and Endangered   | . 10 |  |
| X.    | The P   | roposed Rulemaking   | 41   |  |
|       |   |  |      |  |
| XI.   | I. Conclusion   |  |      |  |
|       |   |  |      |  |